IN THE UNTED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

GUY STEVEN CARAWAY	)	
	)	**CAUSE NO.:_____**
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	**Judge Nancy J. Rosenstengel**
v.	)	
	)	
SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, LLC., SYNGENTA AG, and CHEVRON U.S.A., INC.,	)	**Related to MDL No. 3:21-md-03004-NJR**
	)	**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
Defendants.	)	

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

COME NOW the Plaintiff, Guy Steven Caraway, and brings this Complaint against Defendants SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION LLC, SYNGENTA AG, CHEVRON U.S.A. INC., and as grounds therefor shows unto this Honorable Court as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF THE CASE

1. Paraquat is a synthetic chemical compound that since the mid-1960s has been developed, registered, manufactured, distributed, sold for use, and used as an active ingredient in herbicide products ("Paraquat") developed, registered, formulated, distributed, and sold for use in the United States, including the State of Alabama.

2. Defendants are companies and successors-in-interest to companies that manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in Alabama, acted in concert with others who manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in Alabama; sold and used Paraquat in Alabama; or owned property in Alabama where Paraquat was used.

3. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway brings this suit against Defendants to recover damages for personal injuries resulting from his exposure to Paraquat over many years in Alabama.

4. Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of the State of Alabama, whose injuries and claims arise from, and were caused by, exposure to Paraquat within the State of Alabama.

II. PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

5. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway is over the age of eighteen years, a citizen and resident of the State of Alabama, who suffers from Parkinson's Disease ("PD") caused by exposure to Paraquat within the State of Alabama.

B. Defendants

6. Defendant Syngenta Crop Protection LLC ("SCPLLC") is a Delaware company with its principal place of business in Greensboro, North Carolina. SCPLLC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant Syngenta AG.

7. Defendant Syngenta AG ("SAG") is a foreign corporation with its principal place of business in Basel, Switzerland.

8. Defendant Chevron U.S.A., Inc. ("Chevron U.S.A.") is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in San Ramon, California.

III. EQUITABLE TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

9. Plaintiff had no way of knowing about Defendants' conduct with respect to the health risks associated with the use of Paraquat. There is no way that Plaintiff, through the exercise of reasonable care, could have discovered the conduct by Defendants alleged herein. Further, Plaintiff did not discover and did not know of facts that would have caused a reasonable person to

suspect Defendants engaged in the conduct alleged herein. For these reasons, the discovery rule tolls all statutes of limitations applicable to Plaintiff' claims.

10. Additionally, by failing to provide immediate notice of the adverse health effects associated with continued use of and/or exposure to Paraquat, Defendants concealed their conduct and the existence of the claims asserted herein from Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, Defendants intended their acts to conceal the facts and claims from Plaintiff and other individuals regularly exposed to Paraquat. Plaintiff was unaware of the facts alleged herein without any fault or lack of diligence on their part and could not have reasonably discovered Defendants' conduct. For these reasons, any statute of limitations that otherwise may apply to Plaintiff's claims should be tolled.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §1332 because there is complete diversity of the Plaintiff and the Defendants and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants by virtue of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation's June 8, 2021, Transfer Order that centralized actions against Defendants in the Southern District of Illinois.

13. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to the June 8, 2021, Transfer Order.

V. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

A. Defendants and Their Predecessors.

1. Syngenta Crop Protection LLC and Syngenta AG

14. In 1926, four (4) British chemical companies merged to create the British company that then was known as Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., and ultimately was known as Imperial Chemical Industries PLC ("ICI").

15. In or about 1971, ICI created or acquired a wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, which at various times was known as Atlas Chemical Industries Inc., ICI North America Inc., ICI America Inc., and ICI United States Inc., and ultimately was known as ICI Americas Inc. (collectively "ICI Americas").

16. In or about 1992, ICI merged its pharmaceuticals, agrochemicals, and specialty chemicals businesses, including the agrochemicals business it had operated at one time through a wholly-owned British subsidiary known as Plant Protection Ltd. and later as a division within ICI, into a wholly-owned British subsidiary known as ICI Bioscience Ltd.

17. In 1993, ICI demerged its pharmaceuticals, agrochemicals, and specialty chemicals businesses, from which it created the Zeneca Group, with the British company Zeneca Group PLC as its ultimate parent company.

18. As a result of ICI's demerger and creation of the Zeneca Group, ICI Bioscience Ltd. was demerged from ICI and merged into, renamed, or continued its business under the same or similar ownership and management as Zeneca Ltd., a wholly-owned British subsidiary of Zeneca Group PLC.

19. Before ICI's demerger and creation of the Zeneca Group, ICI had a Central Toxicology Laboratory that performed and hired others to perform health and safety studies that were submitted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture ("USDA") and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to secure and maintain the registration of Paraquat and other pesticides for use in the United States.

20. As a result of ICI's demerger and creation of the Zeneca Group, ICI's Central Toxicology Laboratory became Zeneca Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory.

21. After ICI's demerger and creation of the Zeneca Group, Zeneca Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory continued to perform, and hire others to perform, health and safety studies that were submitted to EPA to secure and maintain the registration of Paraquat and other pesticides for use in the United States.

22. As a result of ICI's demerger and creation of the Zeneca Group, ICI Americas was demerged from ICI and merged into, renamed, or continued its business under the same or similar ownership and management as Zeneca, Inc. ("Zeneca"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Zeneca Group PLC organized under the laws of the State of Delaware.

23. In 1996, the Swiss pharmaceutical and chemical companies Ciba-Geigy Ltd. and Sandoz AG merged to create the Novartis Group, with the Swiss company Novartis AG as the ultimate parent company.

24. As a result of the merger that created the Novartis Group, Ciba-Geigy Corporation, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Ciba-Geigy Ltd. organized under the laws of the State of New York, was merged into or continued its business under the same or similar ownership and management as Novartis Crop Protection, Inc. ("NCPI"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Novartis AG organized under the laws of the State of Delaware.

25. In 1999, the Swedish pharmaceutical company Astra AB merged with Zeneca Group PLC to create the British company AstraZeneca PLC, of which Zeneca Ltd. and Zeneca were wholly-owned subsidiaries.

26. In 2000, Novartis AG and AstraZeneca PLC spun off and merged the Novartis

Group's crop protection and seeds businesses and AstraZeneca's agrochemicals business to create the Syngenta Group, a global group of companies focused solely on agribusiness, with Defendant Syngenta AG ("SAG") as the ultimate parent company.

27. As a result of the Novartis/AstraZeneca spinoff and merger that created the Syngenta Group, Zeneca Ltd. was merged into, renamed, or continued its business under the same or similar ownership and management as Syngenta Ltd., a wholly-owned British subsidiary of SAG.

28. As a result of the Novartis/AstraZeneca spinoff and merger that created the Syngenta Group, Zeneca Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory became Syngenta Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory.

29. Since the Novartis/AstraZeneca spinoff and merger that created the Syngenta Group, Syngenta Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory has continued to perform and hire others to perform health and safety studies for submission to the EPA to secure and maintain the registration of Paraquat and other pesticides for use in the United States.

30. As a result of the Novartis/AstraZeneca spinoff and merger that created the Syngenta Group, NCPI and Zeneca were merged into and renamed, or continued to do their business under the same or similar ownership and management, as Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. ("SCPI"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SAG organized under the laws of the State of Delaware.

31. In 2010, SCPI was converted into Defendant Syngenta Crop Protection LLC ("SCPLLC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of SAG organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business in Greensboro, North Carolina.

32. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Novartis AG.

33. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor AstraZeneca PLC.

34. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Zeneca Group PLC.

35. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Imperial Chemical Industries PLC, previously known as Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd.

36. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor ICI Bioscience Ltd.

37. SAG is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Plant Protection Ltd.

38. SCPLLC is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor SCPI.

39. SCPLLC is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor NCPI.

40. SCPLLC is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Ciba-Geigy Corporation.

41. SCPLLC is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Zeneca Inc.

42. SCPLLC is a successor by merger or continuation of business to its corporate predecessor ICI Americas Inc., previously known as Atlas Chemical Industries Inc., ICI North America Inc., ICI America Inc., and ICI United States Inc.

43. SCPLLC does substantial business in the State of Alabama, including the following:

a. markets, advertises, distributes, sells, and delivers Paraquat and other pesticides to distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers in the State of Alabama;

b. secures and maintains the registration of Paraquat and other pesticides with the EPA and the State of Alabama to enable itself and others to manufacture, distribute, sell, and use these products in the State of Alabama; and

c. performs, hires others to perform, and funds or otherwise sponsors or otherwise funds the testing of pesticides in the State of Alabama.

44. SAG is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of Switzerland, with its principal place of business in Basel, Switzerland.

45. SAG is a holding company that owns stock or other ownership interests, either directly or indirectly, in other Syngenta Group companies, including SCPLLC.

46. SAG is a management holding company.

47. Syngenta Crop Protection AG ("SCPAG"), a Swiss corporation with its principal place of business in Basel, Switzerland, is one of SAG's direct, wholly-owned subsidiaries.

48. SCPAG employs the global operational managers of production, distribution, and marketing for the Syngenta Group's Crop Protection ("CP") and Seeds Divisions.

49. The Syngenta Group's CP and Seeds Divisions are the business units through which SAG manages its CP and Seeds product lines.

50. The Syngenta Group's CP and Seeds Divisions are not and have never been corporations or other legal entities.

51. SCPAG directly and wholly-owns Syngenta International AG ("SIAG").

52. SIAG is the "nerve center" through which SAG manages the entire Syngenta Group.

53. SIAG employs the "Heads" of the Syngenta Group's CP and Seeds Divisions.

54. SIAG also employs the "Heads" and senior staff of various global functions of the Syngenta Group, including Human Resources, Corporate Affairs, Global Operations, Research and Development, Legal and Taxes, and Finance.

55. Virtually all of the Syngenta Group's global "Heads" and their senior staff are housed in the same office space in Basel, Switzerland.

56. SAG is the indirect parent of SCPLLC through multiple layers of corporate ownership:

a. SAG directly and wholly-owns Syngenta Participations AG;

b. Syngenta Participations AG directly and wholly-owns Seeds JV C.V.;

c. Seeds JV C.V. directly and wholly-owns Syngenta Corporation;

d. Syngenta Corporation directly and wholly-owns Syngenta Seeds, LLC;

e. Syngenta Seeds, LLC directly and wholly-owns SCPLLC.

57. Before SCPI was converted to SCPLLC, it was incorporatesd in Delaware, had its principal place of business in North Carolina, and had its own board of directors.

58. SCPI's sales accounted for more than 47% of the sales for the entire Syngenta Group in 2019.

59. SAG has purposefully organized the Syngenta Group, including SCPLLC, in such a way as to attempt to evade the authority of courts in jurisdictions in which it does substantial business.

60. Although the formal legal structure of the Syngenta Group is designed to suggest otherwise, SAG in fact exercises an unusually high degree of control over its country-specific business units, including SCPLLC, through a "matrix management'' system of functional reporting to global "Product Heads" in charge of the Syngenta Group's unincorporated Crop Protection and Seeds Divisions, and to global "Functional Heads" in charge of human resources, corporate affairs, global operations, research and development, legal and taxes, and finance.

61. The lines of authority and control within the Syngenta Group do not follow its formal legal structure, but instead follow this global "functional" management structure.

62. SAG controls the actions of its far-flung subsidiaries, including SCPLLC, through this global "functional" management structure.

63. SAG's board of directors has established a Syngenta Executive Committee ("SEC"), which is responsible for the active leadership and the operative management of the Syngenta Group, including SPLLC.

64. The SEC consists of the CEO and various global Heads, which currently are:

a. The Chief Executive Officer;

b. Group General Counsel;

c. The President of Global Crop Protection;

d. The Chief Financial Officer;

e. The President of Global Seeds; and

f. The Head of Human Resources;

65. SIAG employs all of the members of the Executive Committee.

66. Global Syngenta Group corporate policies require SAG subsidiaries, including SPLLC, to operate under the direction and control of the SEC and other unincorporated global management teams.

67. SAG's board of directors meets five (5) to six (6) times per year.

68. In contrast, SCPI's board of directors rarely met, either in person or by telephone, and met only a handful of times over the last decade before SCPI became SCPLLC.

69. Most, if not all, of the SCPI board's formal actions, including selecting and removing SCPI officers, were taken by unanimous written consent pursuant to directions from the SEC or other Syngenta Group global or regional managers that were delivered via e-mail to SCPI board members.

70. Since SCPI became SCPLLC, decisions that are normally made by the board or managers of SCPLLC in fact continue to be directed by the SEC or other Syngenta Group global or regional managers.

71. Similarly, Syngenta Seeds, Inc.'s board of directors appointed and removed SCPI board members at the direction of the SEC or other Syngenta Group global or regional managers.

72. Since SCPI became SCPLLC, the appointment and removal of the manager(s) of SCPLLC continues to be directed by the SEC or other Syngenta Group global or regional managers.

73. The management structure of the Syngenta Group's CP Division, of which SCPLLC is a part, is not defined by legal, corporate relationships, but by functional reporting relationships that disregard corporate boundaries.

74. Atop the CP Division is the CP Leadership Team (or another body with a different name but substantially the same composition and functions), which includes the President of

Global Crop Protection, the CP region Heads (including SCPLLC President Vern Hawkins), and various global corporate function Heads.

75. The CP Leadership Team meets bi-monthly to develop strategy for new products, markets, and operational efficiencies and to monitor performance of the Syngenta Group's worldwide CP business.

76. Under the CP Leadership Team are regional leadership teams, including the North America Regional Leadership Team (or another body with a different name but substantially the same composition and functions), which oversees the Syngenta Croup's U.S. and Canadian CP business (and when previously known as the NAFTA Regional Leadership Team, also oversaw the Syngenta Group's Mexican CP business).

77. The North America Regional Leadership Team is chaired by SCPLLC's president and includes employees of SCPLLC and the Syngenta Group's Canadian CP company (and when previously known as the NAFTA Regional Leadership Team, also included employees of the Syngenta Group's Mexican CP company).

78. The Syngenta Group's U.S. and Canadian CP companies, including SCPLLC, report to the North America Regional Leadership Team, which reports the CP Leadership Team, which reports to the SEC, which reports to SAG's board of directors.

79. Some members of the North America Regional Leadership Team, including some SCPLLC employees, report or have in the past reported not to their nominal superiors within the companies that employ them, but directly to the Syngenta Group's global Heads.

80. Syngenta Group global Heads that supervise SCPLLC employees participate and have in the past participated in the performance reviews of these employees and in setting their compensation.

81. The Syngenta Group's functional reporting lines have resulted in employees of companies, including SCPLLC, reporting to officers of remote parent companies, officers of affiliates with no corporate relationship other than through SAG, or officers of subsidiary companies.

82. SCPLLC performs its functions according to its role in the CP Division structure:

a. CP Division development projects are proposed at the global level, ranked and funded at the global level after input from functional entities such as the CP Leadership Team and the North America Regional Leadership Team, and given final approval by the SEC;

b. New CP products are developed by certain Syngenta Group companies or functional groups that manage and conduct research and development functions for the entire CP Division;

c. These products are then tested by other Syngenta Group companies, including SCPLLC, under the direction and supervision of the SEC, the CP Leadership Team, or other Syngenta Group global managers;

d. Syngenta Group companies, including SCPLLC, do not contract with or compensate each other for this testing;

e. Rather, the cost of such testing is included in the testing companies' operating budgets, which are established and approved by the Syngenta Group's global product development managers and the SEC;

f. If a product shows promise based on this testing and the potential markets for the product, either global or regional leaders (depending on whether the

target market is global or regional), not individual Syngenta Group companies such as SCPLLC, decide whether to sell the product;

g. Decisions to sell the product must be approved by the SEC; and

h. The products that are sold all bear the same Syngenta trademark and logo.

83. SCPLLC is subject to additional oversight and control by Syngenta Group global managers through a system of "reserved powers" established by SAG and applicable to all Syngenta Group companies.

84. These "reserved powers" require Syngenta Croup companies to seek approval for certain decisions from higher levels within the Syngenta Group's functional reporting structure.

85. For example, although SAG permits Syngenta Croup companies to handle small legal matters on their own, under the "reserved powers" system, SAG's Board of Directors must approve settlements of certain types of lawsuits against Syngenta Group companies, including SCPLLC, if their value exceeds an amount specified in the "reserved powers."

86. Similarly, the appointments of senior managers at SCPLLC must be approved by higher levels than SCPLLC's own management, board of directors, or even its direct legal owner.

87. Although SCPLLC takes the formal action necessary to appoint its own senior managers, this formal action is in fact merely the rubber-stamping of decisions that have already been made by the Syngenta Group's global management. Although SAG subsidiaries, including SCPLLC, pay lip service to legal formalities that give the appearance of authority to act independently, in practice many of their acts are directed or pre-approved by the Syngenta Group's global management.

88. SAG and the global management of the Syngenta Group restrict the authority of SCPLLC to act independently in areas including:

a. Product development;

b. Product testing (among other things, SAG and the global management of the Syngenta Group require SCPLLC to use Syngenta Ltd.'s Central Toxicology Laboratory to design, perform, or oversee product safety testing that SCPLLC submits to the EPA in support of the registrations of Paraquat and other pesticides);

c. Production;

d. Marketing;

e. Sales;

f. Human resources;

g. Communications and public affairs;

h. Corporate structure and ownership;

i. Asset sales and acquisitions;

j. Key appointments to boards, committees and management positions;

k. Compensation packages;

l. Training for high-level positions; and

m. Finance (including day-to-day cash management) and tax.

89. Under the Syngenta Group's functional management system, global managers initiate, and the global Head of Human Resources oversees, international assignments and compensation of managers employed by one Syngenta subsidiary to do temporary work for another Syngenta subsidiary in another country. This international assignment program aims, in part, to

improve Syngenta Group-wide succession planning by developing corporate talent to make employees fit for higher positions within the global Syngenta Group of companies.

90. Under this international assignment program, at the instance of Syngenta Group global managers, SCPLLC officers and employees have been "seconded" to work at other SAG subsidiaries, and officers and employees of other Syngenta Group subsidiaries have been "seconded" to work at SCPLLC.

91. The Syngenta Group's functional management system includes a central global finance function—known as Syngenta Group Treasury—for the entire Syngenta Group.

92. The finances of all Syngenta Group companies are governed by a global treasury policy that subordinates the financial interests of SAG's subsidiaries, including SCPLLC, to the interests of the Syngenta Group as a whole.

93. Under the Syngenta Group's global treasury policy, Syngenta Group Treasury controls daily cash sweeps from subsidiaries such as SCPLLC, holds the cash on account, and lends it to other subsidiaries that need liquidity.

94. The Syngenta Group's global treasury policy does not allow SAG subsidiaries such as SCPLLC to seek or obtain financing from non-Syngenta entities without the approval of Syngenta Group Treasury.

95. Syngenta Group Treasury also decides whether SCPLLC will issue a dividend or distribution to its direct parent company, and how much that dividend will be.

96. SCPLLC's board or management approves dividends and distributions mandated by Syngenta Group Treasury without any meaningful deliberation.

97. SAG, through its agent or alter ego, SCPLLC, does substantial business in the State of Alabama, in the ways previously alleged as to SCPLLC.

2. Chevron

98. Chevron Chemical Company ("Chevron Chemical") was a corporation organized in 1928 under the laws of the State of Delaware.

99. In 1997, Chevron Chemical was merged into Chevron Chemical Company LLC ("Chevron Chemical LLC"), a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware.

100. In the mid-2000s, Chevron Chemical LLC was merged into or continued to operate under the same or similar ownership and management as Chevron Phillips Chemical Company LP ("CP Chemical").

101. CP Chemical is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Chevron Chemical LLC.

102. CP Chemical is a successor by merger or continuation of business to its corporate predecessor Chevron Chemical.

103. Defendant Chevron U.S.A. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the State of California.

104. Defendant Chevron U.S.A. is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor Chevron Chemical LLC.

105. Defendant Chevron U.S.A. is a successor in interest to the crop-protection business of its corporate predecessor CP Chemical.

106. In the mid-2000s, Chevron USA entered into an agreement in which it expressly assumed the liabilities of Chevron Chemical and Chevron Chemical LLC arising from Chevron Chemical's then-discontinued agrichemical business, which included the design, registration,

manufacture, formulation, packaging, labeling, distribution, marketing, and sale of Paraquat products in the United States as alleged in this Complaint.

B. Paraquat Manufacture, Distribution, and Sale

107. ICI, a legacy company of Syngenta, claims to have discovered the herbicidal properties of Paraquat in 1955.

108. The leading manufacturer of Paraquat is Syngenta, which (as ICI) developed the active ingredient in Paraquat in the early 1960s.

109. ICI produced the first commercial Paraquat formulation and registered it in England in 1962.

110. Paraquat was marketed in 1962 under the brand name Gramoxone.

111. Paraquat first became commercially available for use in the United States in 1964.

112. In or about 1964, ICI and Chevron Chemical entered into agreements regarding the licensing and distribution of Paraquat ("the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements").

113. In or about 1971, ICI Americas became a party to the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements on the same terms as ICI.

114. The ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements were renewed or otherwise remained in effect until about 1986.

115. In the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas granted Chevron Chemical a license to their patents and technical information to permit Chevron Chemical to formulate or have formulated, use, and sell Paraquat in the United States and to grant sub-licenses to others to do so.

116. In the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, Chevron Chemical granted ICI and ICI Americas a license to its patents and technical information to permit ICI and ICI Americas to

formulate or have formulated, use, and sell Paraquat throughout the world and to grant sub-licenses to others to do so.

117. In the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas and Chevron Chemical agreed to exchange patent and technical information regarding Paraquat.

118. In the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas granted Chevron Chemical exclusive rights to distribute and sell Paraquat in the United States.

119. In the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas granted Chevron Chemical a license to distribute and sell Paraquat in the U.S. under the ICI-trademarked brand name Gramoxone.

120. ICI and ICI Americas and Chevron Chemical entered into the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements to divide the worldwide market for Paraquat between them.

121. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, Chevron Chemical distributed and sold Paraquat in the U.S. and ICI and ICI Americas distributed and sold Paraquat outside the United States.

122. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements and related agreements, both ICI and ICI Americas and Chevron Chemical distributed and sold Paraquat under the ICI-trademarked brand name Gramoxone.

123. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas and Chevron Chemical exchanged patent and technical information regarding Paraquat.

124. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements, ICI and ICI Americas provided to Chevron Chemical health and safety and efficacy studies performed or procured by ICI's Central Toxicology Laboratory, which Chevron Chemical then submitted to the USDA and the EPA to

secure and maintain the registration of Paraquat for manufacture, formulation, distribution, and sale for use in the United States.

125. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements and related agreements, ICI and ICI Americas manufactured and sold Paraquat to Chevron Chemical that Chevron Chemical then distributed and sold in the United States, including in Alabama, where Chevron Chemical registered Paraquat products with the State of Alabama and marketed, advertised, and promoted them to Alabama distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers.

126. Under the ICI-Chevron Chemical Agreements and related agreements, Chevron Chemical distributed and sold Paraquat in the United States under the ICI-trademarked brand name Gramoxone and other names, including in Alabama, where Chevron Chemical registered such products with the State of Alabama to enable them to be lawfully distributed, sold, and used in Alabama, and marketed, advertised, and promoted them to Alabama distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers.

127. SAG and its corporate predecessors and others with whom they acted in concert have manufactured, formulated, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in the United States from about 1964 through the present, and at all relevant times intended or expected their Paraquat products to be distributed and sold in Alabama, where they registered such products with the State of Alabama to enable them to be lawfully distributed, sold, and used in Alabama, and marketed, advertised, and promoted them to Alabama distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers.

128. SAC and its corporate predecessors and others with whom they acted in concert have submitted health and safety and efficacy studies to the USDA and the EPA to support the registration of Paraquat for manufacture, formulation, distribution, and sale for use in the United States from about 1964 through the present.

129. SCPLLC and its corporate predecessors and others with whom they acted in concert have manufactured, formulated, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in the United States from about 1971 through the present, and at all relevant times intended or expected their Paraquat products to be distributed and sold in Alabama, where they registered such products with the State of Alabama to enable them to be lawfully distributed, sold, and used in Alabama, and marketed, advertised, and promoted them to Alabama distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers.

130. SCPLLC and its corporate predecessors and others with whom they acted in concert have submitted health and safety and efficacy studies to the EPA to support the registration of Paraquat for manufacture, formulation, distribution, and sale for use in the U.S. from about 1971 through the present.

131. On information and belief, Chevron Chemical manufactured, formulated, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in the United States, acting in concert with ICI and ICI Americas throughout this period, including in Alabama, where Chevron Chemical registered such products with the State of Alabama to enable them to be lawfully distributed, sold, and used in Alabama, and marketed, advertised, and promoted them to Alabama distributors, dealers, applicators, and farmers.

132. From the early 1980's to 2000, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was repeatedly exposed to and inhaled, ingested, or absorbed Paraquat in or around Alabama while working on a commercial farm, family farm, forestry work and working at gas company. He was repeatedly exposed to and inhaled, ingested, or absorbed Paraquat in or around Alabama when he was using large mixers and applying via tractor, plane sprayer, hand sprayer and helicopter to apply Paraquat. Paraquat was used for weed control.

133. As a direct result of his exposure to Paraquat, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway began suffering symptoms associated with PD and was diagnosed with PD in approximately 2024.

134. No doctor or any other person ever told Plaintiff that the diagnosed PD was or could have been caused by exposure to Paraquat.

135. Before Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's diagnosis, Plaintiff had never read or heard of any articles in newspapers, scientific journals, or other publications that associated PD with Paraquat.

136. Before Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's diagnosis, Plaintiff had never read or heard of any lawsuit alleging that Paraquat causes PD.

137. At no time when Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was present as Paraquat was being sprayed was he aware that exposure to Paraquat could cause any latent injury, including any neurological injury or PD, or that any precautions were necessary to prevent any latent injury that could be caused by exposure to Paraquat.

138. On information and belief, the Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was sold and used in Alabama, and was manufactured, distributed, and on information and belief sold by one or more of the Defendants and their corporate predecessors and others with whom they acted in concert intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

139. On information and belief, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat manufactured, distributed, and sold at different times as to each Defendant, its corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert, and not necessarily throughout the entire period of the Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's exposure as to any particular Defendant, its corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert.

140. On information and belief, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat that was sold and used in Alabama, and was manufactured, distributed, and sold by SCPLLC, its corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert, including Chevron Chemical, intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

141. On information and belief, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat that was sold and used in Alabama, and was manufactured, distributed, and sold by SAG, its corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert, including Chevron Chemical, intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

142. On information and belief, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat that was sold and used in Alabama, and was manufactured, distributed, and sold by Chevron Chemical, acting in concert with ICI and ICI Americas, intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in West Virginia.

C. Paraquat Use

143. Since 1964, Paraquat has been used in the United States to kill broadleaf weeds and grasses before the planting or emergence of more than 100 field, fruit, vegetable, and plantation crops, to control weeds in orchards, and to desiccate (dry) plants before harvest. At all relevant times, the use of Defendants' Paraquat for these purposes was intended or directed by or reasonably foreseeable to, and was known to or foreseen by, Defendants.

144. At all relevant times, where Paraquat was used, it was commonly used multiple times per year on the same land, particularly when used to control weeds in orchards or on farms with multiple crops planted on the same land within a single growing season or year, and such use was as intended or directed or reasonably foreseeable. The use of Defendants' Paraquat for these

purposes was intended or directed by or reasonably foreseeable to and was known to or foreseen by Defendants.

145. At all relevant times, Paraquat manufactured, distributed, sold, and sprayed or caused to be sprayed by Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert was typically sold to end-users in the form of liquid concentrates (and less commonly in the form of granular solids) designed to be diluted with water before or after loading it into the tank of a sprayer and applied by spraying it onto target weeds.

146. At all relevant times, concentrates containing Paraquat manufactured, distributed, sold, and sprayed or caused to be sprayed by Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert typically were formulated with one or more "surfactants" to increase the ability of the herbicide to stay in contact with the leaf, penetrate the leaf's waxy surface, and enter into plant cells, and the accompanying instructions typically told end-users to add a surfactant or crop oil (which as typically formulated contains a surfactant) before use.

147. At all relevant times, Paraquat typically was applied with a knapsack sprayer, hand-held sprayer, aircraft (i.e., crop duster), truck with attached pressurized tank, or tractor-drawn pressurized tank, and such use was as intended or directed or was reasonably foreseeable.

D. Paraquat Exposure

148. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that when Paraquat was used in the manner intended or directed or in a reasonably foreseeable manner, users of Paraquat and persons nearby would be exposed to Paraquat while it was being mixed and loaded into the tanks of sprayers, including spills, splashes, and leaks.

149. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that when Paraquat was used in the manner intended or directed or in a reasonably foreseeable manner, persons who sprayed

Paraquat or were in or near areas where it was being or recently had been sprayed would be exposed to Paraquat, including as a result of spray drift, the movement of herbicide spray droplets from the target area to an area where herbicide application was not intended, typically by wind, and as a result of contact with sprayed plants.

150. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that when Paraquat was used in the manner intended or directed or in a reasonably foreseeable manner, users of Paraquat and persons nearby would be exposed to Paraquat, including spills, splashes, and leaks, while equipment used to spray it was being emptied or cleaned or clogged spray nozzles, lines, or valves were being cleared.

151. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat could enter the human body via absorption through or penetration of the skin, mucous membranes, and other epithelial tissues, including tissues of the mouth, nose and nasal passages, trachea, and conducting airways, particularly where cuts, abrasions, rashes, sores, or other tissue damage was present.

152. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat could enter the human body via respiration into the lungs, including the deep parts of the lungs where respiration (gas exchange) occurred.

153. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat could enter the human body via ingestion into the digestive tract of small droplets swallowed after entering the mouth, nose, or conducting airways.

154. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat that entered the human body via ingestion into the digestive tract could enter the enteric nervous system (the part of the nervous system that governs the function of the gastrointestinal tract).

155. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat that entered the human body, whether via absorption, respiration, or ingestion, could enter the bloodstream.

156. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat that entered the bloodstream could enter the brain, whether through the blood-brain barrier or parts of the brain not protected by the blood-brain barrier.

157. At all relevant times, it was reasonably foreseeable that Paraquat that entered the nose and nasal passages could enter the brain through the olfactory bulb (a part of the brain involved in the sense of smell), which is not protected by the blood-brain barrier.

E. Parkinson's Disease

158. Parkinson's Disease, or "PD." is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder of the brain that affects primarily the motor system, the part of the central nervous system that controls movement.

159. Scientists who study PD generally agree that fewer than 10% of all PD cases are caused by inherited genetic mutations alone, and that more than 90% are caused by a combination of environmental factors, genetic susceptibility, and the aging process.

1. Symptoms and Treatment

160. The characteristic symptoms of PD are its "primary" motor symptoms: resting tremor (shaking movement when the muscles are relaxed), bradykinesia (slowness in voluntary movement and reflexes), rigidity (stiffness and resistance to passive movement), and postural instability (impaired balance).

161. PD's primary motor symptoms often result in "secondary'' motor symptoms such as freezing of gait; shrinking handwriting; mask-like expression; slurred, monotonous, quiet

voice; stooped posture; muscle spasms; impaired coordination; difficulty swallowing; and excess saliva and drooling caused by reduced swallowing movements.

162. Non-motor symptoms-such as loss of or altered sense of smell; constipation; low blood pressure on rising to stand; sleep disturbances; and depression-are present in most cases of PD, often for years before any of the primary motor symptoms appear.

163. There is currently no cure for PD. No treatment will slow, stop, or reverse its progression, and the treatments most-commonly prescribed for its motor symptoms tend to become progressively less effective, and to cause unwelcome side effects, the longer they are used.

2. Pathophysiology

164. The selective degeneration and death of dopaminergic neurons (dopamine-producing nerve cells) in a part of the brain called the substantia nigra pars compacta ("SNpc") is one of the primary pathophysiological hallmarks of PD.

165. Dopamine is a neurotransmitter (a chemical messenger that transmits signals from one neuron to another neuron, muscle cell, or gland cell) that is critical to the brain's control of motor function (among other things).

166. The death of dopaminergic neurons in the SNpc decreases the production of dopamine.

167. Once dopaminergic neurons die, they are not replaced; when enough dopaminergic neurons have died, dopamine production falls below the level the brain requires for proper control of motor function, resulting in the motor symptoms of PD.

168. The presence of Lewy bodies (insoluble aggregates of a protein called alpha-synuclein) in many of the remaining dopaminergic neurons in the SNpc is another of the primary pathophysiological hallmarks of PD. Dopaminergic neurons are particularly susceptible to

oxidative stress, a disturbance in the normal balance between oxidants present in cells and cells' antioxidant defenses.

169. Scientists who study PD generally agree that oxidative stress is a major factor in—if not the precipitating cause of—the degeneration and death of dopaminergic neurons in the SNpc and the accumulation of Lewy bodies in the remaining dopaminergic neurons that are the primary pathophysiological hallmarks of PD.

F. Paraquat' s Toxicity

170. Paraquat is highly toxic to both plants and animals.

171. Paraquat injures and kills plants by creating oxidative stress that causes or contributes to cause the degeneration and death of plant cells.

172. Paraquat injures and kills humans and other animals by creating oxidative stress that causes or contributes to cause the degeneration and death of animal cells.

173. Paraquat creates oxidative stress in the cells of plants and animals because of "redox properties" that are inherent in its chemical composition and structure: it is a strong oxidant, and it readily undergoes "redox cycling" in the presence of molecular oxygen, which is plentiful in living cells.

174. The redox cycling of Paraquat in living cells interferes with cellular functions that are necessary to sustain life—photosynthesis in the case of plant cells and cellular respiration in the case of animal cells.

175. The redox cycling of Paraquat in living cells creates a "reactive oxygen species" known as superoxide radical, an extremely reactive molecule that can initiate a cascading series of chemical reactions that creates other reactive oxygen species that damage lipids, proteins, and

nucleic acids—molecules that are essential components of the structures and functions of living cells.

176. Because the redox cycling of Paraquat can repeat indefinitely in the conditions typically present in living cells, a single molecule of Paraquat can trigger the production of countless molecules of destructive superoxide radical.

177. Paraquat's redox properties have been known since at least the 1930s.

178. That Paraquat is toxic to the cells of plants and animals because it creates oxidative stress through redox cycling has been known since at least the 1960s.

179. The surfactants with which the concentrates containing Paraquat manufactured, distributed, and sold by Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert, typically were formulated were likely to increase Paraquat's toxicity to humans by increasing its ability to stay in contact with or penetrate the skin, mucous membranes, and other epithelial tissues, including tissues of the mouth, nose and nasal passages, trachea, and conducting airways, the lungs, and the gastrointestinal tract.

G. Paraquat and PD

180. The same redox properties that make Paraquat toxic to plant cells and other types of animal cells make it toxic to dopaminergic neurons—Paraquat is a strong oxidant that interferes with the function of, damages, and ultimately kills dopaminergic neurons by creating oxidative stress through redox cycling.

181. Although PD is not known to occur naturally in any species other than humans, PD research is often performed using "animal models," in which scientists artificially produce in laboratory animals' conditions that show features of PD.

182. Paraquat is one of only a handful of toxins that scientists use to produce animal models of PD.

183. In animal models of PD, hundreds of studies involving various routes of exposure have found that Paraquat creates oxidative stress that results in the degeneration and death of dopaminergic neurons in the SNpc, other pathophysiology consistent with that seen in human PD, and motor deficits and behavioral changes consistent with those commonly seen in human PD.

184. Hundreds of in vitro studies have found that Paraquat creates oxidative stress that results in the degeneration and death of dopaminergic neurons (and many other types of animal cells).

185. Many epidemiological studies (studies of the patterns and causes of disease in defined populations) have found an association between Paraquat exposure and PD, including multiple studies finding a two- to five-fold (or greater) increase in the risk of PD in populations with occupational exposure to Paraquat compared to populations without such exposure.

186. Defendants had knowledge of these studies and the relationship between Paraquat exposure and PD but actively and fraudulently concealed this information from Plaintiff and others.

H. Paraquat Regulation

187. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA"), 7 U.S.C. §136 et seq., which regulates the distribution, sale, and use of pesticides within the United States, requires that pesticides be registered with the EPA prior to their distribution, sale, or use, except as described by FIFRA. 7 U.S.C. 136a(a).

188. As part of the pesticide registration process, the EPA requires, among other things, a variety of tests to evaluate the potential for exposure to pesticides, toxicity to people and other potential non-target organisms, and other adverse effects on the environment.

189. As a rule, FIFRA requires registrants to perform health and safety testing of pesticides. FIFRA does not require the EPA to perform health and safety testing of pesticides itself, and the EPA generally does not perform such testing.

190. The EPA registers (or re-registers) a pesticide if it believes, based largely on studies and data submitted by the registrant, that:

a. its composition is such as to warrant the proposed claims for it, 7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(5)(A);

b. its labeling and other material required to be submitted comply with the requirements of FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(5)(B);

c. it will perform its intended function without unreasonable adverse effects on the environment, 7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(5)(C); and

d. when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice it will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment, 7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(5)(D).

191. FIFRA defines "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment'' as "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." 7 U.S.C. § 136(bb).

192. Under FIFRA, "[a]s long as no cancellation proceedings are in effect registration of a pesticide shall be prima facie evidence that the pesticide, its labeling and packaging comply with the registration provisions of [FIFRA]." 7 U.S.C. § 136a(f)(2).

193. However, FIFRA further provides that "[i]n no event shall registration of an article be construed as a defense for the commission of any offense under [FIFRA]." 7 U.S.C. § 136a(f)(2).

194. The distribution or sale of a pesticide that is misbranded is an offense under FIFRA, which provides in relevant part that "it shall be unlawful for any person in any State to distribute or sell to any person . . . any pesticide which is . . . misbranded." 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(1)(E).

195. A pesticide is misbranded under FIFRA if, among other things:

a. its labeling bears any statement, design, or graphic representation relative thereto or to its ingredients that is false or misleading in any particular, 7 U.S.C. § 136(q)(1)(A);

b. the labeling accompanying it does not contain directions for use which are necessary for effecting the purpose for which the product is intended and if complied with, together with any requirements imposed under Section 136a(d) of the title, are adequate to protect health and the environment, 7 U.S.C. § 136(q)(1)(F); or

c. the label does not contain a warning or caution statement that may be necessary and if complied with, together with any requirements imposed under section 136a(d) of the title, is adequate to protect health and the environment," 7 U.S.C. § 136(q)(l)(G).

196. Plaintiff do not seek in this action to impose on Defendants any labeling or packaging requirement in addition to or different from those required under FIFRA; accordingly, any allegation in this complaint that a Defendant breached a duty to provide adequate directions for the use of Paraquat or warnings about Paraquat, breached a duty to provide adequate packaging

for Paraquat, or concealed, suppressed, or omitted to disclose any material fact about Paraquat or engaged in any unfair or deceptive practice regarding Paraquat, that allegation is intended and should be construed to be consistent with that alleged breach, concealment, suppression, or omission, or unfair or deceptive practice, having rendered the Paraquat "misbranded" under FIFRA; however, Plaintiff bring claims and seeks relief in this action only under state law, and do not bring any claims or seek any relief in this action under FIFRA.

VI. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO SPECIFIC CAUSES OF ACTION

A. Strict Product Liability – Design Defect

197. At all relevant times, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert were engaged in the U.S. Paraquat business.

198. At all relevant times, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert were engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, distributing, and selling pesticides, and designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

199. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat sold and used in Alabama that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

200. The Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was in a defective condition that made it unreasonably dangerous, in that when used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner:

a. it was designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

201. This defective condition existed in the Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed when it left the control of Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert and was placed into the stream of commerce.

202. As a result of this defective condition, the Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed either failed to perform in the manner reasonably to be expected in light of its nature and intended function, or the magnitude of the dangers outweighed its utility.

203. The Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with

whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner.

B. Strict Product Liability – Failure to Warn

204. At all times relevant to this claim, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert were engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, distributing, and selling pesticides, and designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

205. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat sold and used in Alabama that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

206. When Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold the Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert knew or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known that when used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner:

a. it was designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

207. The Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was in a defective condition that made it unreasonably dangerous when it was used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner, in that:

a. it was not accompanied by directions for use that would have made it unlikely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. it was not accompanied by a warning that when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and that repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute

to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

208. This defective condition existed in the Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed when it left the control of Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert and was placed into the stream of commerce.

209. As a result of this defective condition, the Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed either failed to perform in the manner reasonably to be expected considering its nature and intended function, or the magnitude of the dangers outweighed its utility.

210. The Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner.

C. Negligence

211. At all times relevant to this claim, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert were engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, distributing, and selling pesticides, and designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

212. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat sold and used in Alabama that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert

designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

213. The Paraquat that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold and to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner.

214. At all times relevant to this claim, in designing, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, distributing, and selling Paraquat, and in acting in concert with others who did so, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert owed a duty to exercise ordinary care for the health and safety of the persons whom it was reasonably foreseeable could be exposed to it, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway.

215. When Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, packaged, labeled, distributed, and sold the Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, it was reasonably foreseeable, and Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert knew or in the exercise of ordinary case should have known, that when Paraquat was used in the intended and directed manner or a reasonably foreseeable manner:

a. it was designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

216. In breach of the aforementioned duty to Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert negligently:

a. failed to design, manufacture, formulate, and package Paraquat to make it unlikely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed.

b. designed, manufactured, and formulated Paraquat such that when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure;

c. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which exposure to Paraquat was likely to occur through inhalation, ingestion, and absorption into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed;

d. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which Paraquat spray drift was likely to occur, including its propensity to drift, the distance it was likely to drift, and the extent to which Paraquat spray droplets were likely to enter the bodies of persons spraying it or other persons nearby during or after spraying;

e. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which Paraquat, when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and the extent to which repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure;

f. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which Paraquat, when formulated or mixed with surfactants or other pesticides or used along with other pesticides, and inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it

had been sprayed, was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and the extent to which repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure;

g. failed to direct that Paraquat be used in a manner that would have made it unlikely to have been inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

h. failed to warn that when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, Paraquat was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

D. Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability

217. At all times relevant to this claim, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert were engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, distributing, and selling Paraquat and other restricted-use pesticides and themselves out as having knowledge or skill regarding Paraquat and other restricted-use pesticides.

218. At all times relevant to this claim, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat sold and used in Alabama that Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert designed, manufactured, distributed, and sold intending or expecting that it would be sold and used in Alabama.

219. At the time of each sale of Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert impliedly warranted that it was of merchantable quality, including that it was fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods were used.

220. Defendants, Defendants' corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert breached this warranty regarding each sale of Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, in that it was not of merchantable quality because it was not fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods were used, and in particular:

a. it was designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent neurological damage that was

both permanent and cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop long after exposure.

COUNT I
STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY – DESIGN DEFECT

221. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

222. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants designed, researched, manufactured, tested, advertised, promoted, sold, and/or distributed Paraquat products as described above to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, including in the State of Alabama.

223. Paraquat products were expected to and did reach the usual consumers, handlers, and persons coming into contact with it without substantial change in the condition in which they were produced, manufactured, sold, distributed, and/or marketed by Defendants, including in the State of Alabama.

224. At those times, Paraquat products were in an unsafe, defective condition that was unreasonably dangerous to users, and in particular, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

225. For many years, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Defendants' Paraquat products regularly and repeatedly for hours at a time resulting in regular, repeated, and prolonged exposure of Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway to Paraquat.

226. The Paraquat products designed, researched, manufactured, tested, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold, and/or distributed by Defendants were defective in design or formulation in that, when they left the hands of the manufacturer and/or suppliers, the foreseeable risks exceeded the benefits associated with the design or formulation of the Paraquat products.

227. The Paraquat products designed, researched, manufactured, tested, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold, and/or distributed by Defendants were defective in design and/or formulation, in that, when they left the hands of Defendants or their manufacturers and/or suppliers, they were unreasonably dangerous, unreasonably dangerous in normal use, and they were more dangerous than an ordinary consumer would expect. On balance, the unreasonable risks posed by Paraquat products outweighed the benefits of their design.

228. At all relevant times, Paraquat products were in a defective condition and unsafe, and Defendants knew or had reason to know they were defective and unsafe, especially when used in the form and manner as intended by Defendants. In particular, the Paraquat products were defective in the following ways:

a. Paraquat products were designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that when so used, Paraquat was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used them, while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they have been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used them, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed, Paraquat was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent, permanent, and cumulative neurological or renal damage, and repeated neurodegenerative disease, including PD to develop over time and manifest long after exposure.

229. In breach of their duty to Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, Defendants acted negligently, and in conscious disregard for the safety of Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway and others:

a. failed to design, manufacture, formulate, and package Defendants' Paraquat products to make Paraquat unlikely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used them, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed;

b. designed and manufactured Paraquat and designed and formulated Defendants' Paraquat products such that when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used Defendants' Paraquat products, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed, Paraquat was likely to cause latent, cumulative, and permanent neurological or renal damage, and repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant renal or neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop over time and manifest long after exposure;

c. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which exposure to Paraquat was likely to occur through inhalation, ingestion, and absorption; into the bodies of persons who used them, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed;

d. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which spray drift from Defendants' Paraquat products was likely to occur, including their propensity

e. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which Paraquat, when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into bodies of persons who used Defendants' Paraquat products, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed, was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent, cumulative, and permanent neurological or renal damage, and the extent to which repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause clinically significant renal or neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop over time and manifest long after exposure;

f. failed to perform adequate testing to determine the extent to which Paraquat, when formulated or mixed with surfactants or other pesticides, and inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used Defendants' Paraquat products, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed, was likely to cause or contribute to cause latent, cumulative, and permanent neurological or renal damage, and the extent to which repeated exposures were likely to cause or contribute to cause significant renal or neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop over time and manifest long after exposure;

g. failed to direct that Defendants' Paraquat products be used in a manner that would have made it unlikely for Paraquat to have been inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used Defendants' Paraquat products, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed; and

h. failed to warn that when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used Defendants' Paraquat products, were nearby while they were being used, or entered fields or orchards where they had been sprayed or areas near where they had been sprayed, Paraquat was likely to cause or contribute to cause significant renal or neurodegenerative disease, including PD, to develop over time and manifest long after exposure.

230. Defendants knew or should have known that at all relevant times that their Paraquat products were in a defective condition and were (and are) unreasonably dangerous and unsafe and would create a substantial risk of harm to persons who used them, were nearby while Paraquat products were being used, or entered fields or orchards where Paraquat products had been sprayed or areas near where Paraquat products had been sprayed.

231. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to Paraquat without knowledge of Paraquat's dangerous characteristics.

232. Armed with this knowledge, Defendants voluntarily designed their Paraquat products with a dangerous condition knowing that in normal, intended use, consumers such as Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would be exposed to the product and its dangers.

233. The Paraquat products designed, researched, manufactured, tested, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold, and/or distributed by Defendants reached their intended users in the same defective and unreasonably dangerous condition in which it was manufactured.

234. Defendants designed, researched, manufactured, tested, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold, and/or distributed a defective product, which created an unreasonable risk to the consumer and to Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway in particular, and Defendants are therefore strictly liable for the injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

235. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway could not, by the exercise of reasonable care, have discovered Paraquat's defects herein mentioned or perceived its danger.

236. Defendants are thus strictly liable to Plaintiff for the manufacturing, marketing, promoting, distribution, and/or selling of a defective product.

237. Defendants' defective design of Paraquat products amounts to willful, wanton, and/or reckless conduct.

238. As a direct and proximate result of the defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were the cause or a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's injuries, including Parkinson's Disease.

239. As a result of the foregoing acts and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway suffered severe and personal injuries as alleged above that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain, and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

240. At the time of Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's exposure to Paraquat, Paraquat was being used for purposes and in a manner normally intended, as a broad-spectrum pesticide.

241. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained the claimed injuries.

242. As a direct and proximate result of the defective and unreasonably dangerous condition of the Paraquat manufactured, distributed, and sold by Defendants, their corporate predecessors, and others with whom they acted in concert, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD; has suffered severe and permanent physical pain, mental anguish, and disability, and will continue to do so for the remainder of the Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's life; has suffered the loss of a normal life and will continue to do so for the remainder of the Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's life; has lost income that he otherwise would have earned and will continue to do so for the remainder of the Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's life; and has incurred reasonable expenses for necessary medical treatment and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory, treble and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT II
FAILURE TO WARN

243. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

244. Defendants engaged in the business of selling, testing, distributing, supplying, manufacturing, marketing, and/or promoting Paraquat, and through that conduct have knowingly and intentionally placed Paraquat into the stream of commerce with full knowledge that it reaches

consumers such as Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway who was exposed to it through ordinary and reasonably foreseeable uses.

245. Defendants did in fact sell, distribute, supply, manufacture, and/or promote Paraquat products. Additionally, Defendants expected the Paraquat that they were selling, distributing, supplying, manufacturing, and/or promoting to reach Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway without any substantial change in the condition of the product from when it was initially distributed.

246. At the time of manufacture, Defendants knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care, should have known that:

a. Defendants' Paraquat products were designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of people who used it, who were nearby when it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and.

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the body, it was likely to cause latent neurological or renal damage that was both permanent and cumulative, and that repeated exposures were likely to cause renal or neurodegenerative disease, including PD.

247. At all relevant times, Defendants' Paraquat products were in a defective condition such that it was unreasonably dangerous to those exposed to them and was so at the time they were distributed by Defendants and at the time Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to and/or ingested the product. The defective condition of Paraquat was due in part to the fact that it was not accompanied by proper warnings regarding its toxic qualities and possible health effects,

including, but not limited to, developing PD or renal disease as a result of exposure. That defective condition was not a common propensity of the Paraquat products that would be obvious to a user of those products.

248. Defendants' Paraquat products did not contain a necessary warning or caution statement that, if complied with, would have been adequate to protect the health of those exposed in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(1)(E).

249. Defendants failed to include a necessary warning or caution statement that, if complied with, would have been adequate to protect the health of those exposed.

250. Defendants could have revised Paraquat's label to provide additional warnings.

251. This defect caused serious injury to Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, who was exposed to Paraquat in its intended and foreseeable manner.

252. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to properly design, manufacture, compound, test, inspect, package, label, distribute, market, examine, maintain supply, provide proper warnings, and take such steps to assure that the product did not cause users to suffer from unreasonable and dangerous side effects.

253. Defendants labeled, distributed, and promoted a product that was dangerous and unsafe for the use and purpose for which it was intended.

254. Defendants failed to warn of the nature and scope of the health risks associated with Paraquat, namely its toxic properties and its propensity to cause or serve as a substantial contributing factor in the development of PD or renal disease.

255. Defendants knew of the probable consequences of exposure to Paraquat. Despite this fact, Defendants failed to exercise reasonable care to warn of the dangerous toxic properties and risks of developing PD or renal disease from Paraquat exposure, even though these risks were

known or reasonably scientifically knowable at the time of distribution. Defendants willfully and deliberately failed to avoid the consequences associated with its failure to warn, and in doing so, acted with conscious disregard for Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's safety.

256. At the time of exposure, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway could not have reasonably discovered any defect in Paraquat through the exercise of reasonable care.

257. Defendants, as manufacturers and/or distributors of Paraquat, are held to the level of knowledge of an expert in the field. There was unequal knowledge with respect to the risk of harm, and Defendants, as manufacturers of Paraquat products possessed superior knowledge and knew or should have known that harm would occur in the absence of a necessary warning.

258. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway reasonably relied on the skill, superior knowledge, and judgment of Defendants.

259. Had Defendants properly disclosed the risks associated with Paraquat, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would have taken steps to avoid exposure to Paraquat.

260. The information that Defendants provided failed to contain adequate warnings and precautions that would have enabled users to use the product safely and with adequate protection. Instead, Defendants disseminated information that was inaccurate, false, and misleading and that failed to communicate accurately or adequately the comparative severity, duration, and extent of the risk of injuries with use of and/or exposure to Paraquat; continued to promote the efficacy of Paraquat, even after they knew or should have known of the unreasonable risks from exposure; and concealed, downplayed, or otherwise suppressed, through aggressive marketing and promotion, any information or research about the risks and dangers of exposure to Paraquat.

261. To this day, Defendants have failed to adequately warn of the true risks of exposure to Paraquat, including the risks manifested by Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's injuries associated

with exposure to Paraquat. As a result of its inadequate warnings, Paraquat was defective and unreasonably dangerous when it left Defendants' possession and/or control, was distributed by Defendants, and when Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed to it.

262. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained the claimed injuries.

263. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD, and suffered severe and personal injuries that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care, has lost income that he otherwise would have earned and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory, treble and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT III
NEGLIGENCE

264. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

265. Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care in the designing, researching, testing, manufacturing, marketing, supplying, promoting, packaging, sale, and/or distribution of Paraquat products into the stream of commerce, including a duty to assure that the product would not cause those exposed to it to suffer unreasonable and dangerous side effects.

266. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in the designing, researching, testing, manufacturing, marketing, supplying, promoting, packaging, sale, quality assurance, quality control, and/or distribution of Paraquat products in that Defendants knew or should have known that persons foreseeably exposed to Paraquat products were placed at a high risk of suffering unreasonable and dangerous side effects, including, but not limited to, the development of PD or renal disease, as well as other severe and personal injuries that were permanent and lasting in nature; physical pain and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life; and a need for lifelong medical treatment, monitoring, and/or medications.

267. The negligence by Defendants, their agents, servants, and/or employees, included but was not limited to the following acts and/or omissions:

a. Manufacturing, producing, promoting, formulating, creating, and/or designing Paraquat products without thoroughly testing it;

b. Failing to test Paraquat products and/or failing to adequately, sufficiently, and properly test Paraquat products;

c. Not conducting sufficient testing programs to determine whether Paraquat products were safe for use -- Defendants knew or should have known that Paraquat products were unsafe and unfit for use because of the dangers to those exposed to it;

d. Not conducting sufficient testing programs and studies to determine Paraquat product's effects on human health even after Defendants had knowledge of studies linking Paraquat products to latent neurological damage and neurodegenerative disease, including PD, and renal disease;

e. Negligently failing to adequately and correctly warn Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, the public, the medical and agricultural professions, and the EPA of the dangers of Paraquat products;

f. Failing to provide adequate cautions and warnings to protect the health of persons who would reasonably and foreseeably be exposed to Paraquat products;

g. Negligently marketing, advertising, and recommending the use of Paraquat products without sufficient knowledge as to its dangerous propensities;

h. Negligently representing that Paraquat products were safe for use for its intended purpose when, in fact, it was unsafe;

i. Negligently representing that Paraquat products had equivalent safety and efficacy as other forms of herbicides;

j. Negligently designing Paraquat products in a manner that was dangerous to others;

k. Negligently manufacturing Paraquat products in a manner that was dangerous to others;

l. Negligently producing Paraquat products in a manner that was dangerous to others;

m. Negligently formulating Paraquat products in a manner that was dangerous to others;

n. Concealing information from Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway while knowing that Paraquat products were unsafe, dangerous, and/or non-conforming with EPA regulations;

o. Improperly concealing and/or misrepresenting information from Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, scientific and medical professionals, and/or the EPA, concerning the severity of risks and dangers of Paraquat products compared to other forms of herbicides; and

p. Negligently selling Paraquat products with a false and misleading label.

268. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained the claimed injuries.

269. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD, and suffered severe and personal injuries that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care, has lost income that he otherwise would have earned and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT IV
BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY

270. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

271. At all relevant times, Defendants were engaged in the business of selling Paraquat products and was a merchant with respect to those products.

272. At all relevant times, Defendants intended and expected that Defendants' Paraquat products would be sold and used.

273. Defendants developed, manufactured, distributed, and sold Paraquat for use in formulating Defendants' Paraquat products, and developed, registered, formulated, and distributed Defendants' Paraquat products for sale in the United States.

274. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed Defendants' Paraquat products regularly and repeatedly, for hours at a time, resulting in regular, repeated, and prolonged exposure to Paraquat.

275. At the time of each sale of Defendants' Paraquat products that resulted in Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's exposure to Paraquat, Defendants impliedly warranted that Defendants' Paraquat products were of merchantable quality, including that they were fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods were used.

276. The Paraquat to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed was not fit for the ordinary purposes for which it was used, and in particular:

a. it was designed, manufactured, formulated, and packaged such that it was likely to be inhaled, ingested, and absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed; and

b. when inhaled, ingested, or absorbed into the bodies of persons who used it, who were nearby while it was being used, or who entered fields or orchards where it had been sprayed or areas near where it had been sprayed, it was likely to cause neurological damage that was both permanent and

cumulative, and repeated exposures were likely to cause neurodegenerative disease, including PD.

277. Defendants breached this warranty as to the sale of Defendants' Paraquat products that resulted in Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's exposure to Paraquat and caused the injuries described herein.

278. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained the claimed injuries.

279. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD, and suffered severe and personal injuries that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care, has lost income that he otherwise would have earned and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory, treble and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT V
VIOLATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS AND DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES

280. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

281. Plaintiff plead all Counts of this Complaint in the broadest sense, pursuant to all laws that may apply according to choice of law principles, including the laws of Alabama and Illinois.

282. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway used Defendants' Products and suffered ascertainable losses as a result of Defendants' actions in violation of the consumer protection practices or have made false representations in violation of the consumer protection law, Alabama Rev. Code Ann. §§ 1345.01, et seq.

283. Defendants' conduct, as described herein, was extreme and outrageous.

284. As a result of the foregoing acts and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway suffered severe and personal injuries as alleged above that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain, and mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

285. Defendants' conduct, as described herein, was extreme and outrageous. Defendants risked the lives of the consumers and users of their products, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, with knowledge of the safety problems with their product and suppressed this knowledge from the general public, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's healthcare providers. Defendants made conscious decisions not to redesign, re-label, warn or inform the unsuspecting consuming public. Defendants' outrageous conduct warrants an award of punitive damages.

286. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained the claimed injuries.

287. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD, and suffered severe and personal injuries that are permanent and lasting in nature, physical pain and

mental anguish, including diminished enjoyment of life, and financial expenses for hospitalization and medical care, has lost income that he otherwise would have earned and will continue to do so for the remainder of his life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory, treble and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT VI
PRODUCT LIABILITY DESIGN & MANUFACTURING DEFECT- ALABAMA EXTENDED MANUFACTURER'S LIABILITY DOCTRINE

288. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

289. In the interest of protection of claims in the event of remand or state specific application, Plaintiff brings this product liability claim against Defendants for defective design & manufacturing under the Alabama Extended Manufacturer's Liability Doctrine (AEMLD).

290. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants engaged in the business of testing, developing, designing, manufacturing, marketing, selling, distributing, and promoting Paraquat products, which are defective and unreasonably dangerous to consumers and users and other persons coming into contact them, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway thereby placing Paraquat products into the stream of commerce. These actions were under the ultimate control and supervision of Defendants. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants designed, researched, developed, formulated, manufactured, produced, tested, assembled, labeled, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold, and distributed the Paraquat products used by Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway , and/or to which Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway was exposed, as described above.

291. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants' Paraquat products were manufactured, designed, and labeled in an unsafe, defective, and inherently dangerous manner that was dangerous for use by or exposure to the public, and, in particular, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

292. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants' Paraquat products reached the intended consumers, handlers, and users or other persons coming into contact with these products in Alabama and throughout the United States, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway , without substantial change in their condition as designed, manufactured, sold, distributed, labeled, and marketed by Defendant.

293. Defendants' Paraquat products, as researched, tested, developed, designed, licensed, formulated, manufactured, packaged, labeled, distributed, sold, and marketed by Defendants were defective in design and formulation in that when they left the hands of the Defendant's manufacturers and/or suppliers, they were unreasonably dangerous and dangerous to an extent beyond that which an ordinary consumer would contemplate.

294. Defendants' Paraquat products, as researched, tested, developed, designed, licensed, formulated, manufactured, packaged, labeled, distributed, sold, and marketed by Defendants were defective in design and formulation in that when they left the hands of Defendants' manufacturers and/or suppliers, the foreseeable risks associated with these products' reasonably foreseeable uses exceeded the alleged benefits associated with their design and formulation.

295. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants knew or had reason to know that Paraquat products were defective and were inherently dangerous and unsafe when used in the manner instructed and provided by Defendants.

296. Therefore, at all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants' Paraquat products, as researched, tested, developed, designed, licensed, manufactured, packaged, labeled, distributed, sold and marketed by Defendants, were defective in design and formulation, in one or more of the following ways:

a. When placed in the stream of commerce, Defendants' Paraquat products were defective in design and formulation, and, consequently, dangerous to an extent beyond that which an ordinary consumer would contemplate.

b. When placed in the stream of commerce, Defendants' Paraquat products were unreasonably dangerous in that they were hazardous and posed a grave risk of PD and other serious illnesses when used in a reasonably anticipated manner.

c. When placed in the stream of commerce, Defendants' Paraquat products contained unreasonably dangerous design defects and were not reasonably safe when used in a reasonably anticipated or intended manner.

d. Defendants did not sufficiently test, investigate, or study its Paraquat product.

e. Exposure to Paraquat presents a risk of harmful side effects that outweighs any potential utility stemming from its use.

f. Defendants knew or should have known at the time of marketing its Paraquat products that exposure to Paraquat, could result in PD and other severe illnesses and injuries and death.

g. Defendants did not conduct adequate post-marketing surveillance of its Paraquat products.

h. Defendants could have employed safer alternative designs and formulations.

297. At all times relevant to this litigation, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway used and/or was exposed to the use of Defendants' Paraquat products in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner without knowledge of their dangerous characteristics.

298. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway t could not have reasonably discovered the defects and risks associated with Paraquat before or at the time of exposure.

299. The harm caused by Defendants' Paraquat products far outweighed their benefit, rendering Defendants' products dangerous to an extent beyond that which an ordinary consumer would contemplate. Defendants' Paraquat products were and are more dangerous than alternative products and Defendants could have designed its Paraquat products to make them less dangerous. Indeed, at the time that Defendants designed its Paraquat products, the state of the industry's scientific knowledge was such that a less risky design or formulation was attainable.

300. At the time Paraquat products left Defendants' control, there was a practical, technically feasible, and safer alternative design that would have prevented the harm without substantially impairing the reasonably anticipated or intended function of Defendants' Paraquat.

301. Defendants' defective design of Paraquat amounts to willful, wanton, and/or reckless conduct by Defendants.

302. Therefore, as a result of the unreasonably dangerous condition of its Paraquat products, Defendants are strictly liable to Plaintiff.

303. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained their injuries.

304. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants placing its defective Paraquat products into the stream of commerce, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD and suffered severe injuries, endured physical pain and discomfort, as well as economic hardship, including considerable financial expenses for medical care and treatment.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

COUNT VII
PRODUCT LIABILITY FAILURE TO WARN- ALABAMA EXTENDED MANUFACTURER'S LIABILITY DOCTRINE

305. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

306. In the interest of protection of claims in the event of remand or state specific application, Plaintiff bring this product liability claim against Defendants for failure to warn under the Alabama Extended Manufacturer's Liability Doctrine (AEMLD).

307. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants engaged in the business of testing, developing, designing, manufacturing, marketing, selling, distributing, and promoting Paraquat products, which are defective and unreasonably dangerous to consumers, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, because they do not contain adequate warnings or instructions concerning the dangerous characteristics of Paraquat. These actions were under the ultimate control and supervision of Defendants.

308. Defendants researched, developed, designed, tested, manufactured, inspected, labeled, distributed, marketed, promoted, sold, and otherwise released into the stream of commerce

its Paraquat products, and in the course of same, directly advertised or marketed the products to consumers and end users, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway , and Defendants therefore had a duty to warn of the risks associated with the reasonably foreseeable uses (and misuses) of Paraquat.

309. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants had a duty to properly test, develop, design, manufacture, inspect, package, label, market, promote, sell, distribute, maintain supply, provide proper warnings, and take such steps as necessary to ensure that its Paraquat products did not cause users and consumers to suffer from unreasonable and dangerous risks. Defendants had a continuing duty to warn Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway of the dangers associated with Paraquat use and exposure. Defendants, as manufacturers, sellers, or distributors of chemicals, are held to the knowledge of an expert in the field.

310. At the time of manufacture, Defendants could have provided warnings or instructions regarding the full and complete risks of Paraquat products because it knew or should have known of the unreasonable risks of harm associated with the use of and/or exposure to these products.

311. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants failed to investigate, study, test, or promote the safety or to minimize the dangers to users and consumers of its Paraquat products and to those who would foreseeably use or be harmed by Defendant's product, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

312. Even though Defendants knew or should have known that Paraquat products posed a grave risk of harm, it failed to warn of the dangerous risks associated with their use and exposure. The dangerous propensities of Paraquat, as described above, were known to Defendants, or scientifically knowable to Defendants through appropriate research and testing by known methods,

at the time it distributed, supplied, or sold the product, and not known to end users and consumers, such as Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

313. Defendants knew or should have known that its Paraquat created significant risks of serious bodily harm to consumers, as alleged herein, and Defendants failed to adequately warn consumers and reasonably foreseeable users of the risks of exposure to these products. Defendants have wrongfully concealed information concerning the dangerous nature of Paraquat and further made false and/or misleading statements concerning the safety of Paraquat.

314. At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants' Paraquat products reached the intended consumers, handlers, and users or other persons coming into contact with these products throughout the United States, including Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway, without substantial change in their condition as designed, manufactured, sold, distributed, labeled, and marketed by Defendants.

315. At all times relevant to this litigation, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway used and/or was exposed to the use of Defendants' Paraquat products in their intended or reasonably foreseeable manner without knowledge of their dangerous characteristics.

316. Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway could not have reasonably discovered the defects and risks associated with Paraquat before or at the time of Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway 's exposure Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway relied upon the skill, superior knowledge, and judgment of Defendants.

317. Defendants knew or should have known that the minimal warnings disseminated with its Paraquat products were inadequate, but it failed to communicate adequate information on the dangers and safe use/exposure and failed to communicate warnings and instructions that were

appropriate and adequate to render the products safe for their ordinary, intended, and reasonably foreseeable uses, including agricultural and horticultural applications.

318. The information that Defendants did provide or communicate failed to contain relevant warnings, hazards, and precautions that would have enabled agricultural workers, horticultural workers and/or at-home users such as Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway to utilize the products safely and with adequate protection. Instead, Defendants disseminated information that was inaccurate, false, and misleading and which failed to communicate accurately or adequately the comparative severity, duration, and extent of the risk of injuries and death associated with use of and/or exposure to Paraquat; continued to aggressively promote the efficacy of its products, even after it knew or should have known of the unreasonable risks from use or exposure; and concealed, downplayed, or otherwise suppressed, through aggressive marketing and promotion, any information or research about the risks and dangers of exposure to Paraquat.

319. To this day, Defendants have failed to adequately and accurately warn of the true risks of Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's injuries associated with the use of and exposure to Paraquat.

320. As a result of their inadequate warnings, Defendants' Paraquat products were defective and unreasonably dangerous when they left the possession and/or control of Defendants, were distributed by Defendants, and used by Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway

321. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for the injuries Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway caused by its failure, as described above, to provide adequate warnings or other clinically relevant information and data regarding the appropriate use of its Paraquat products and the risks associated with the use of or exposure to Paraquat.

322. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway's injuries, and, but for Defendant's misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained their injuries.

323. Had Defendants provided adequate warnings and instructions and properly disclosed and disseminated the risks associated with its Paraquat products, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway could have avoided the risk of developing injuries as alleged herein and could have obtained alternative products.

324. The defects in Defendants' Paraquat products were substantial and contributing factors in causing Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway injuries, and, but for Defendants' misconduct and omissions, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway would not have sustained their injuries.

325. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants placing its defective Paraquat products into the stream of commerce, Plaintiff Guy Steven Caraway developed PD and suffered severe injuries, endured physical pain and discomfort, as well as economic hardship, including considerable financial expenses for medical care and treatment.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands a jury trial on the issues contained herein.

VIII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 38(b), Plaintiff respectfully demand a jury trial on all issues triable by jury.

IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For the reasons stated herein and as will be proven, Plaintiff requests this Court to enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against the Defendants for:

a. Actual and compensatory damages in an amount greater than $75,000.00

b. Exemplary and punitive and treble damages sufficient to punish and deter the Defendants and others from future fraudulent practices;

c. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

d. Costs including reasonable attorneys' fees, court costs, and other litigation expenses;

e. Any other further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Wesley L. Laird (Bar ID: 1956A41W)
Laird Trial Law LLC
501 N. Main Street
Opp, AL 36467
T: (334) 493-9716
F: (334) 493-9715
Wes@lbblawfirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff